Remarks

Claims 1-14 were pending in the application. Claims 1-11 were rejected. Claims 12-14 were withdrawn. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, no claims are canceled, no claims are amended, and claims 15-23 are added. No new matter is presented.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 10 is rejected as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. (US Patent No. 6,089,755). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Okamoto et al. discloses a two-piece bearing sleeve wherein a bearing material thickness is higher near the sleeve ends than near the center (the "back metal" layer being complementary). Performance attributes of the bearing are referenced relative to load fluctuations. Col. 3, line ~58. This appears directed to providing constant oil film thickness. Abstract. No reference is made to the claim 10 "extended operation after a lubricant loss". There has been no showing that Okamoto et al. discloses or suggests the means for this function identified in the present specification or their equivalent structure.

Added dependent claim 21 references the lubrication passageway for which support is seen at line 4 of paragraph 0012. There is no disclosure or suggestion of use of the Okamoto et al. bearing with a pin having such a passageway.

Added dependent claims 22 and 23 reference use in a geared turbofan transmission not disclosed or suggested by Okamoto et al.

Claims Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al. in view of Andler et al. (US Patent No. 6,139,191). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Andler et al. was cited for a circumferentially-varying composition. Applicant notes the different lubricity properties of the two references. The circumferential composition variation in Andler et al. would be expected to circumferentially vary the frictional properties. The longitudinal thickness variation of Okamoto et al., however, would not be expected to

longitudinally vary the friction properties because the nature of the contacting material is constant. These do not appear related.

There is no indication that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found Okamoto et al. deficient at all, let alone deficient in a way for which a solution would be found in Andler et al.

Additionally, there is no reason to believe that, if obvious, Andler et al. would not themselves have adopted the longitudinally-varying concentration.

Additionally, the combination fails to disclose or suggest the particular concentrations of claims 2, 3, 7, and 8.

The combination fails to disclose or suggest the use supporting a gear in a turbofan transmission of claim 9 and new claims 22 and 23.

Added claims 15-20 reference the lubrication passageway for which support is seen at line 4 of paragraph 0012. The combination fails to disclose or suggest this passageway.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
William B. Slate
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: October 17, 2005

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed this 17th day of October, 2005 to the USPTO, at Fax No. 1-571-273-8300.

Antoinette Sullo